

wavelength such that the energy is absorbed in the near surface region of the semiconductor, as now recited in parent Claim 9. Therefore, since the reference Narayan et al. fail to teach or suggest, either expressly or impliedly, the features set forth in the Claims rejected thereon, under 35 USC 103, this ground of rejection should be withdrawn. The newly cited but not applied reference Ishida et al. also fails to teach the features lacking in Narayan et al., except that it teaches doping via a gaseous dopant by laser processing, but fails to suggest the claimed dopant dose rate.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments to the specification and to Claims 1, 9, and 18, it is submitted that each objection and rejection has been overcome, and that this application is in condition for allowance based on Claims 1, 4-7, 9, 10, 12, and 14-20, Claims 2, 3, 11, and 13 having been canceled. Entry of this amendment for appeal purposes is requested if it fails to condition the claims for allowance, since it materially reduces the issue for appeal.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 9/1/98



L. E. Carnahan
Agent for Applicants
Registration No. 20,555
Tel. No. (925) 422-5024